

REMARKS

Claims 29-37 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 2 and 5-41 now remain pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-23, 26, 29-32 and 34-37 over Katz

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-23, 26, 29-32 and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,424,706 to Katz et al. ("Katz"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 29-32 and 34-37 are canceled herein, making the rejection of claims 29-32 and 34-37 now moot.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-23 and 26 recite a method of crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services.

Katz appears to disclose a system and method of accessing the value associated with a pre-purchased amount of telecommunication time for making telephone calls (see Abstract). Customers pre-purchase telecommunication time for use later in placing telephone calls (see col. 1, lines 31). The system and method allows its subscribers to access the value associated with any unused pre-paid telecommunication time for users for acquiring goods and services (see Katz, col. 4, lines 39-56).

Thus, Katz disclose use of pre-paid telecommunication time for the purchase of goods and services. Katz fails to disclose or suggest anything other than acquiring the telecommunication time through a purchase. Katz fails to disclose or suggest crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services, as recited by claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-23 and 26.

A benefit of crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services is, e.g., enticements to attract customers. Katz's invention has nothing to do with enticing customers, as Katz simply relies on a user purchasing telecommunication time. Offering a user wireless airtime units that a user can

use to purchase goods or services potentially can bring a seller new customers that would not have considered using the seller otherwise. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features having such benefits.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-23 and 26 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-15 over Hoffman

In the Office Action, claims 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,980,670 to Hoffman et al. ("Hoffman"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9-15 recite offering wireless airtime units to a user in response to the user performing an action on a web site.

The Examiner alleged that Hoffman disclosed offering wireless airtime units to a user in response to said user performing an action on a web site at col. 4, lines 3-25 and col. 5, lines 15-20 (see Office Action, page 7). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hoffman at col. 4, lines 3-25 discloses electronic rewards that are calculated resultant from a recipient's product purchases. The accrual of points which are credited towards the future purchase of a product or service, such as an automobile, frequent flier miles, or free air time for phone calls (see Hoffman, col. 4, lines 17-20). Thus, Hoffman at col. 4, lines 3-25 discloses accrual of points that can be used to purchase free air time NOT offering wireless airtime units to a user in response to the user performing an action, much less on a web site, as recited by claims 9-15.

Hoffman at col. 5, lines 15-20 discloses the use of the Internet as a means to transmit transaction proposals and other information from a reward provider to a recipient and vice versa. Thus, Hoffman at col. 5, lines 15-20 discloses use of the Internet for the transfer of information, failing to disclose or suggest any type of reward in response to a user performing an action on a web

site, much less offering wireless airtime units to a user in response to the user performing an action on a web site, as recited by claims 9-15.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 9-15 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 33 and 38-41 over Katz in view of Hoffman

In the Office Action, claims 24, 25, 27, 28, 33 and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being obvious over Katz in view of Hoffman. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 33 is canceled herein, making the rejection of claim 33 now moot.

Claims 24, 25, 27 and 28 recite a method of crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services.

As discussed above, Katz fails to disclose or suggest a method of crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services, as recited by claims 24, 25, 27 and 28.

As discussed above, Hoffman discloses accrual of points that can be used to purchase free air time NOT offering wireless airtime units to a user in response to the user performing an action, much less for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services, as recited by claims 24, 25, 27 and 28.

Thus, Hoffman in view of Katz fails to disclose or suggest a method of crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account for interaction of an entity with a seller of goods or services, as recited by claims 24, 25, 27 and 28.

Claims 38-41 recite a processor in communication with both an e-tailer website and a wireless service account, the processor being configured to increase the count of wireless airtime units when an entity performs a desired action on an e-tailer web site.

As discussed above, Katz fails to disclose or suggest anything other than acquiring telecommunication time through a purchase. Katz fails to disclose or suggest a processor in communication with both an e-tailer website and a wireless service account, the processor being configured to increase the count of wireless airtime units when an entity performs a desired action on an e-tailer web site, as recited by claims 38-41.

As discussed above, Hoffman discloses accrual of points that can be used to purchase free air time **NOT** increasing the count of wireless airtime units when an entity performs any action, much less a desired action on an e-tailer web site, as recited by claims 38-41.

Thus, Katz in view of Hoffman would fail to disclose or suggest a processor in communication with both an e-tailer website and a wireless service account, the processor being configured to increase the count of wireless airtime units when an entity performs a desired action on an e-tailer web site, as recited by claims 38-41.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 24, 25, 27, 28 and 38-41 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 18-20 over Walker in view of Hoffman

In the Office Action, claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,669 to Walker ("Walker") in view of Hoffman. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 18-20 recite a method of crediting a wireless device account associated with a user with a given number of wireless airtime units when the user accesses electronic information.

The Examiner acknowledge that Walker discloses offering free phone time to a user in exchange for the use usage of traveling services (see Office Action, page 12). The Examiner alleged that Walker's rewarding for usage of traveling services equates to the claimed crediting when a user accesses electronic information. However, Walker's service is **NOT** the claimed

information. In fact, Walker at col. 8, lines clarifies what is meant by service, i.e., the number of miles traveled, mode of transportation, and the like. Thus, Walker fails to disclose or suggest providing any type of credit for accessing information, much less disclose or suggest crediting a wireless device account associated with a user with a given number of wireless airtime units when the user accesses electronic information, as recited by claims 18-20.

As discussed above, Hoffman discloses accrual of points that can be used to purchase free air time **NOT** crediting a wireless device account associated with a user with a given number of wireless airtime units, much less when the user accesses electronic information, as recited by claims 38-41.

Thus, Walker in view of Hoffman still fails to disclose or suggest crediting a wireless device account associated with a user with a given number of wireless airtime units for any action, much less when the user accesses electronic information, as recited by claims 38-41.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 18-20 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'William H. Bollman', written over a horizontal line.

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df